

The Shakespeare Newsletter

Vol. IX, No. 4

"Knowing I lov'd my books, he furnish'd me . . ."

September, 1959

Dual Victory Restores Free Shakespeare to Central Park in New York City

After a prolonged controversy which lasted from mid-April until mid-June, the free New York City Shakespeare Festival again became a reality for its fourth season. (The first Festival took place in an Amphitheatre overlooking the East River in 1956.) In a decision

handed down on June 17, the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York called Park Commissioner Robert Moses ban "clearly arbitrary, capricious and unreasonable." The Commissioner had suggested a fixed admission fee to cover expenses, incurred by soil erosion, etc. The Commissioner was however victorious in that he was permitted to ask for \$20,000 to cover expenses. The money was rapidly produced by two \$10,000 gifts from the Bernays Foundation and the Anspacher Trust. These funds were used to erect an aluminum chain-link fence to enclose the area, repairing and repainting the stage, a drinking fountain, paving of walks, seats, dressing tents, lighting, etc.

The Commissioner protested that he had been miscast as a villain after three years of active assistance to the Shakespeare Festival. Mr. Papp on the other hand objected to the airing of his invocation of the Fifth Amendment when he appeared before a Congressional Committee to answer questions about alleged Communism. His dramatic victory however assured him that the people of New York wanted the Festival.

Because of the extended controversy, only one play, *Julius Caesar*, was offered and it opened to 2400 spectators on August 3 after hundreds had been turned away. Brooks Atkinson of *The New York Times* was much impressed by the production and thought it one of the best except for a slow moving second act.

Stuart Vaughan directed; Joseph Papp originator of the Festival was the producer.

Macbeth in Boston

Jose Quintero's production of *Macbeth* at the Metropolitan Boston Arts Center Theatre received mixed comments at its opening on July 30. Elliott Norton writing in the *Boston Daily Record* (and the *N. Y. Times*) said it was "more successful as spectacle than as tragedy . . . [he] staged it for melodramatic excitement . . . some of the marching in and out seems a little overdone . . . [but it has] nearly everything but a great *Macbeth*." *Time* (Aug. 10) said "it emerged a moving mixture of sound and fury . . . one of the most spectacular Shakespearean shows yet seen." Henry Hewes of *Saturday Review* (Aug. 15) declared that "While one leaves this production of 'Macbeth' with the feeling that Shakespeare has not been done justice, the story and the character 'have been given interestingly and well.'"

Jason Robards, Jr. and Siobhan McKenna starred in the main roles.

Houseman Quits Directorship of American Festival; Landau Appointed; New Policy Forecast

Two weeks before the close of the fifth repertory season of the American Shakespeare Festival, John Houseman artistic director since 1956, announced his resignation because of differences in "the basic policies governing the management of the Festival." Jack Landau, Mr. Houseman's associate, has been named "major director" and associate producer.

Mr. Houseman charged the executive committee with being unwilling to support the extension of the dramatic activities. He also expressed opposition to the policy of engaging different directors for some of the plays. Heretofore he and Jack Landau have directed all of them. Mr. Lawrence Langner declared that the caution concerning extension of the program resulted from the loss of \$15,000 sustained during the 1958 tour of *Much Ado*.

Members of the entire company were shocked at the resignation, praised the director's "creative leadership," and attributed the growth of the Festival to his personal efforts. Mr. Langner also praised Houseman's work but said that the new plans called for a split in the work between producers and directors, similar to that at the Stratford-upon-Avon Memorial Theatre. He hoped to keep the current acting company together.

The "Dream" in Texas and England

In March 1958 Alex Reeve who for fourteen years was director of production at the Royal Theatre and Opera House at Northampton, England, conceived of a Texan style *Midsummer Night's Dream* which was produced at Howard Payne College where he is presently on the drama staff.

With the actors in cowboy and Indian costume of the 1880's and speaking a deep southern drawl, the play was popularly received in the heart of Texas and went on to greater glory at the State Fair in Dallas later in the Fall.

Under the headline "Best Shakespeare is Found in Texas" a writer in *The Huston Chronicle* (March 20) declared that "Texans, having done almost everything else better than non-Texans, now have scored in the field of Shakespearean drama." Although there was inter-linear cutting, the drama staff maintained that not a line was altered. Everything was funny, even when Lysander and Demetrius almost drew their guns in their quarrel. So were Puck in his Davy Crockett coon-skin cap, Hippolyta as an Indian princess in buck-skin and feathers, and Bottom drawing his "Ah will aggravate mah voice so that ah will roar you as gennle as any sucklin' dove."

When the suggestion was made to present their version in England, offers came in from several English theatres. The College and Community staged an "England or Bust" campaign and raised the \$22,500 needed for the venture.

Accordingly, on June 8 when the Texans opened at the Belgrade Theatre, Coventry, in Shakespeare's own Warwickshire, there was much excitement. But that which was so well received deep in the heart of Texas "falls as flat as last Shrove Tuesday's pancakes," wrote Edmund Gardner of *The Stratford-upon-Avon Herald* (June 12). He found the actors too concerned with "the fact that it was Shakespeare, and . . . 'po-try' they were speaking." To speak verse properly is to speak it without making it obvious that it is verse. But even Mr. Gardner felt that it was perhaps unfair to call this "a very amateurish production" when compared with Peter Hall's production of the same play then showing on the Memorial Theatre stage at Stratford. He found no difficulty with the language, and enjoyed the dialect ("The cawse 'a tr-ew lerve never di-ud run smi-ooth"), overcoming the fairies with a lariat, Puck's charming the runaway bull, and the setting of "The woosel cock so black of hue" to the tune of "Home on the Range."

The play was also seen in several other cities, and at Bristol where it was part of the International Festival of University Theatre.

Oregon Festival's Remodeled Elizabethan Theatre Breaks All Past Records

Entertaining standing room audiences for almost a third of its forty performances, the Oregon Shakespearean Festival of Ashland, Oregon, ended its season on September 3 with a total paid attendance of 36,338 persons. This was almost seven thousand more than in 1958.

Earle Grey Festival Loses Theatre

After ten years of Shakespeare productions at Trinity College, the Earle Grey Shakespeare Festival had to seek elsewhere for a stage when the Trinity College quadrangle became unavailable to them. In an action similar to that of the New York City Festival, but less successful, the Toronto park authorities seemed on the verge of building an open-air theatre, but a cut in the budget suspended any plans. Because other local theatres declined the risk or were unsuitable, the group was forced to suspend operations for the year. The indomitable Earle Grey and his wife Mary Godwin are hoping to resume operations as soon as possible.

The largest attendance was booked for Angus Bowmer's production of *Twelfth Night* (11,000) with James Sandoe's *Antony and Cleopatra* (10,000) and *Measure for Measure* (7,000) and Richard Risso's *King John* (7000) following closely behind. Accompanying TN was the "Maske of the New World" especially written for the Festival by Carl Ritchie. Directed by Jerry Turner, the Maske depicted the Queen's entertainment at the departure of Raleigh, Drake, and Frohisher for the new world. The Maske was the Festival's contribution to Oregon's Centennial celebration.

The Institute of Renaissance Studies offered a series of Gresham Lectures throughout the season. Dr. Dolora Cunningham's series is abstracted on page 30.

Stan Hywet Hall Shakespeare Festival on Unusual Stage

The Second Annual Shakespeare Festival at Stan Hywet Hall in Akron, Ohio, offered some unusual effects and competent acting during its nine day run in July and August.

The open air stage consists of three areas: the beautiful Tudor hall itself which was used for the balcony scenes, the patio and steps leading to it for indoor scenes, and a long runway between the rows of spectators for outdoor and special scenes. Thus the effect of the stage is sometimes proscenium, sometimes apron, and frequently arena. Complications arising from Juliet's taking the potion on the steps of the patio are handled by having her borne off on a stretcher. An interesting innovation - really a return to 18th century staging, - was having a stately funeral procession so that Juliet could be buried on the runway in view of the audience. Thus the ensuing scene was played in the arena area.

The production was directed by Dr. James F. Dunlap of Akron University. Arthur Lithgow, formerly Executive Director of the Antioch Area Theatre which produced the complete works of Shakespeare and now in the same post at Stan Hywet Hall, took the part of the Prologue.

A lecture series on Shakespeare preceded the Festival.

THE SHAKESPEARE NEWSLETTER

Published at Kent, Ohio
Editor and Publisher
LOUIS MARDER
Department of English

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
Kent, Ohio

Six issues annually - Feb., April, May, Sept.
Nov., Dec. - Annual Subscription \$1.00

Entered as Second Class Matter at the
Post Office, Kent, Ohio

Vol. IX: No. 4

September, 1959

Miscellaneous Reflections on the 50th SNL and an Epistolary Shakespeare Club

Unless I am mistaken, this issue of *The Shakespeare Newsletter* is the fiftieth to go to press. I can recall the day I mailed the first one to almost 3000 individuals whose names I had collected from the bylines of Shakespeare articles over the years and from hundreds of college catalogues. Many of those individuals and many more since have become friends whom I occasionally meet at scholarly meetings or through correspondence. Meeting these people, conversing with them, seeing their names on books and articles, corresponding with them, these are the pleasures, the psychic income, that supplies the answer to the eternal query, "Why do you give up the Newsletter? Why do you give it so much of your time? Why don't you finish your book instead? Why do you continue to send Dr. John Doe the Newsletter if he hasn't paid you for four years?"

Does a man raise an orchid for the dollar he will receive for it? Hardly. When a person is doing what he loves, is happy in it, and finds that it gives help and pleasure to others, the work is its own reward. And it can no longer be called work either.

This does not mean, of course, that I do not feel a little chagrined when subscribers ignore the red circle around the expiration date on their address plate. What it does mean is that Shakespeare to me is a fascination and the dollar or two that the reader sends neither augments it or decreases it. The dollar is appreciated, certainly, because it removes some of the pangs of publication. It is the more appreciated because it shows that others too love their Shakespeare and that we are friends to a common interest.

Join The E S C

And it is this closer kinship that I miss at this moment as I fill the last column of the September issue. As I sit alone in my third floor attic surrounded by hundreds of volumes on Shakespeare, I think it would be nice to change the pace by conversing with a group of enthusiasts about things Shakespearean. Being surrounded by books, it would be natural to turn the conversation to them. I would tell stories of their acquisition, their rarity, their usefulness, their friendship. When one has a lot of questions, one must have a lot of friends. What I don't know, my friends tell me. Recently, for example, I purchased a framed copy of a rubbing of the inscription on Shakespeare's tombstone. All I knew was that it was made in 1864 by a Mrs. Robert Balmanno who had apparently gone to Stratford in the Tercenary year of Shakespeare's birth. The name was vaguely familiar. Where had I heard it before? Then I remembered; Richard Altick could help me. I stretched my arm and took down his book on the Cowden Clarkes. From him and an anonymous friend who spoke to me from a volume of 19th cen-

Macbeth: Despair In Seven Stages

John Knoepfle, Southern Illinois University

The degeneration of Macbeth can be traced through a number of set stages by using John Fisher's treatise on the seven penitential psalms as a guide. * John Fisher, later to be executed by Henry VIII, was spiritual advisor to Lady Margaret, mother of Henry VII. At her desire his treatise, made up of sermons he had preached for her, was put into print. A popular work, it went through eight editions between 1508 and 1555. The steps can be described as follows:

1. Consent of the mind: Macbeth's decision to kill Duncan after Malcolm is made Prince of Cumberland.
2. Secret searching to accomplish the deed: indicated in Lady Macbeth's advice to Macbeth at their first meeting.
3. Accomplishing the deed, i.e., corruption of the body as well as the soul of the sinner: murder of Duncan, and Macbeth's reaction, physical and mental.
4. Growing accustomed to the deed, i.e., falling into a deep spiritual sleep: murder piled upon murder.
5. Making boast of the crimes: Macbeth's exchange with the two murderers; his advice to Lady Macbeth to wait until she can applaud the deed.
6. Defense of the error: Macbeth committed until destruction sickens.
7. Final despair: desperate attempt to kill the charmed Macduff rather than submit to Malcolm, and thus make a good end.

This abstract but skims the richness of the comparison. Saint John Fisher's stages are described in detail and are couched in that hearty idiom which pervades the poetry of Shakespeare's drama. Whether Shakespeare actually read the treatise is, of course, impossible to prove; however, the number of printings would indicate that many of his contemporaries, or near contemporaries, did, and from a multitude of unknown sources he may have learned of the stages.

* John Fisher, *English Works, Treatise Concerning . . . Penitential Psalms*, ed. John E. B. Mayor, EETS, Extra Series, 1876. Esp. "De Profundis", pp. 202-208.

So You Want to Produce a Play?

The Free Shakespeare Festival in New York City last season cost \$21,000 to mount and \$9,000 to cast. Since the Festival ran only three weeks, the average cost to maintain the production was \$10,000 a week.

tury *Shakespeareana*, I learned that George and Mary Balmanno were mid-19th century Shakespeare enthusiasts, that they were among the original group that met with Richard Grant White and others in New York in 1852 to form a Shakespeare Society, that Mary was known as a painter, poet, and illustrator (of Byron), and that George Balmanno carried on a long epistolary friendship with Mary Cowden Clarke and that the letters have been published. My rubbing of the tombstone then took on a new and deeper significance and its value has increased a thousandfold. Such is the friendship of books.

And so on into the night. I would like to call this column the first meeting of the Epistolary Shakespeare Club. All are invited to join. Just send a paragraph of reminiscence or interesting comment. We'll meet by Column when we have a quorum.

At the 73rd Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Assoc., N. Y. C., December, 1958

KING LEAR'S REVENGES

Robert P. Adams, University of Washington

One of *King Lear's* strangest and least explained passages has the old King vow "revenges" upon his cruel daughters (II. 4. 281-4).

What are Lear's Revenges?

Editors, from 1880 to 1957, have passed over the 'revenges' in virtual silence. With twentieth-century critics, despite much ingenious dissection of the play, matters are but little better. To Chambers (1925), Lear suffers defeat; he has no revenges. To Campbell (1930) the speech in question shows an almost absurd symbol of impotent wrath. Knight (1930) finds the speech "painfully incongruous" and would have the play read as grotesque comedy: thus Lear's heroic stature vanishes, and his revenge-vows are empty and silly. Heilmann (1948) does not make clear how Lear's revenges fit into the "madness pattern" which he takes to be the play's structural core. Danby (1948) and Leach (1950) are close to Knight: the revenges passage shows a rather unheroic Lear of ludicrous, even "comic self-importance." In sum, this body of criticism denies that Lear attains any meaningful "revenges"; indeed the trend is to deny Lear heroic stature. In fact, most contemporary critics accept some version of Goneril's view of the King: 'Old fools are babes again!' (I. 3. 19).

The present author seeks a critical solution which accords with the play's structure, with revenge-play patterns, and with a view of *King Lear* as a figure of true tragic grandeur. Several suggestions are woven together to attempt a solution of the "revenges" problem. Geoffrey Bush (1956) pointed out parallels between *Hamlet* and *King Lear*: typically the revenger "is driven by a sorrow and desperation beyond Stoic patience, when 'there is so great a fever on goodness that the dissolution of it must cure it'"; the revenger's act is not "performed in resignation or fortitude," but is more like Hamlet's spontaneous leap into Ophelia's grave. Bowers (1940) noted inner dynamics resulting from evolution of the older revenge-drama into a form better suiting artificial and sensational Jacobean tastes. The older plays raised grave moral problems without attempting solutions: the hero's "whole moral outlook was wrenched" with "sufficient intensity to warp his character, drive him into insanity, and eventually ruin him in victory." The newer plays' thematic interest "lay in violent, far-fetched, and surprising situations."

Another pattern of Shakespearean tragedy bears on Lear's revenges. From *Richard II* on, the tragic hero meets a moment of choice. On the one hand (the choice rejected ultimately) he may elect a line of degradation. On the other lies at least hope of gaining a dear objective through virtuous action. That the hero, as the audience is aware, may be deluded at the point of choice only intensifies tragic irony.

Lear's revenges, then, embrace one of the play's most comprehensive paradoxes. Where he gave most love, he has received most hate. By the time of the "revenges" passage, the choices seem clear: to grovel toward death or to embrace the storm's fury. We cannot be limited to Lear's conscious, declared intent as might be possible with an ordinary revenge. Lear's revenge is, paradoxically, to suffer and through suffering to win to a plane of truth and being to which he was previously foreign and from which he was earlier excluded, as it were by an unwise excess of love.

Won't You

Please Check Expiration Date After Your
Name And Send Renewal If Due

Macbeth On A 20th Century Elizabethan Stage

Irving Kreutz, Kenyon College

In the light of what I am going to say about this production of *Macbeth* it is possible that the reader may conclude that notice of it in these pages is a waste of everyone's time. But in fairness to the production let me say here that mine is apparently a minority opinion: the reviewers in the Boston papers excited about it. More important — on the strength of its reception by these critics, announcement has been made that the production will be brought to New York in the fall. All of this makes it important to Shakespeareans. What kind of production was it?

Never had I thought of *Macbeth* as a difficult play, either difficult to stage or difficult to watch, until I saw this production at the Cambridge Festival. What one thinks of the play after it is over offers difficulty of a kind certainly: what is one to make of this man *Macbeth* and his lady? how does it happen that we feel as we do about this "dead butcher and his fiendlike queen"? how can we, as we watch, be convinced that life is a "tale told by an idiot" and yet by the end of the play be so touched by the beauty of what has been said and done? That we, looking at it, pose such questions to ourselves proves *Macbeth* a great play perhaps, but not a difficult one. It took the earnest efforts of the several dozen people connected with this summer's production in Boston to turn the play itself into something difficult. How did they do it?

Shakespearean Staging?

They built a huge stage, stretching back for what often appeared to be nearly a quarter of a mile, and reaching out semi-arena style well into the audience. Thus an actor making an exit from downstage must walk quite a distance to get out of attention's way and an unconscionable one to get out of sight. Exits and entrances which Shakespeare had carefully arranged to make his play move like the wind here slowed the play down to the speed of a sluggish bayou breeze. As a matter of fact, I find that I am becoming less and less enthusiastic about so-called "Shakespearean staging", at least in its current form. Why burden the plays with acres of stage, a dozen exits, and steps leading up to the sky and down into the audience's laps, all on the pretty dubious theory that this is the way things were done in Shakespeare's day? I submit that modern lighting makes nonsense of much of in-the-round curtainless staging. Once you bring Number One down and up again or put on a green jelly for the witches your staging isn't Shakespearean anyway. May I hazard the heretical guess that Shakespeare himself might have been quite charmed with the advantages of a proscenium stage if he had had one? A judicious use of curtains would solve a good many problems that continual black-outs and dim-outs only aggravate. (A recollection of Shakespeare's method of lighting — daylight — would have helped this production in another way: the stage was so dimly lighted that often only familiarity with the play made a positive identification of the characters on stage possible.)

Two huge staircases were erected on either side of the stage and connected above by a great cat-walk. These stairs, leading apparently to the sleeping apartments in the castle, were put to good use in only one scene: the murder of Duncan. Otherwise they were a great nuisance to everyone, I should think. Lady *Macbeth* reminded me of nothing so much as a Ziegfeld girl, as she trailed up and down them.

The music and sound effects accompanying the production are remarkable, nor do I quarrel with the occasional gorgeous panoply of ceremony and parade. But — and it is an old, old cry — all of this may be bril-

liant decoration, but it will be meaningless unless it is an integral part of something more important: the presentation of *Macbeth* and Lady *Macbeth* in a way that will move us to pity and terror, if you will, and to an understanding of them and of ourselves. The great difficulty, a difficulty leading to failure, lay in the playing of these two roles. Certainly, to undertake to act these demanding parts requires great humility as well as confidence, and I was often conscious of both these elements in the players here, Jason Robards, Jr. and Siobhan McKenna. But Mr. Robards was never able to find a way to project into voice and gesture the inner intensity of *Macbeth*, the strength of his nature, a nature corrupted. He remained throughout most of the play a rather sad young man with bandy legs who had got in rather over his head. Miss McKenna whispered and shouted her way about the stage, and her wildly overplayed sleep-walking scene came as no great surprise, since she had been plainly nutty as a fruit-cake from the beginning.

Added Stage Business

I would be tenderer with one or the other or both of them, perhaps, if they had not introduced a really disastrous bit of stage business near the end of the play. After Seyton tells *Macbeth* that the Queen is dead and after he has said (without, I am convinced, knowing the meaning of the lines):

She should have died hereafter

There would have been a time for such a word

this *Macbeth*, as played by Robards, turns and stalks the quarter mile off stage, to return with his dead wife in his arms. And it is to her that he speaks the lines beginning "Tomorrow and tomorrow." Thus, whatever the actor has managed to do to make something more of *Macbeth* than simply an ambition-ridden uxorious opportunist is all for naught. He has thrown it away. I feel quite strongly that the actors must have approved of this unlikely affair, else why on earth were they there on the stage doing it? Or was the director standing in the wings with a loaded gun?

This unwarranted innovation has little justification. Another one is more easily understood, I suppose. Instead of allowing *Macbeth* to make his final exit fighting for his life with *Macduff*, the director has *Macduff* kill him on stage, wounding him first, then strangling him, and finally (from where I was sitting) he appeared to jump up and down on *Macbeth's* body. Why is this better than bringing his head in on a pike? *Macbeth* is the only one of Shakespeare's tragic heroes who does not die on stage in full view of the audience, and the fact that we are not permitted to see him die is important, both from the point of view of pure theatre (the screw turns once more), and from that of our comprehension of the true ethos of the tragedy. But with all their "Shakespearean staging" the producers chose to ignore this! Was it perversity, arrogance, or simply bad judgment? I don't know.

(Dr. Kreutz, Ph. D. Univ. of Wisconsin, has been at Kenyon since 1952 where he teaches some Shakespeare and is Managing Editor of *The Kenyon Review*. He will serve as Drama Editor of *SNL* in the future.

Just Reprinted

A History of SHAKESPEAREAN Criticism

by

Augustus Ralli

2 vols. 566, 582 pages

List Price \$17.50

• — •

Other titles of Shakespeare
interest, published or distributed
by
Humanities Press, Inc.
and
Hillary House Publ. Ltd.

Bradbrook, M. C. *The Growth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy*. 246p. \$3.75

Brown, J. R. *Shakespeare and his Comedies*. 208p. \$3.75

Conklin, P. S. *A History of Hamlet Criticism (1601-1821)*. 176p. \$3.75

Danby, J. F. *Poets on Fortune's Hill. Studies in Sidney, Shakespeare, Beaumont & Fletcher*. 212p. \$4.25

Danby, J. F. *Shakespeare's Doctrine of Nature. A study of King Lear*. 234p. \$3.75

Mahood, M. M. *Shakespeare's Word-play*. 192p. \$3.75

Muir, K. *Shakespeare's Sources Vol. 1. Comedies & Tragedies*. 267p. \$5.00

Partridge, A. C. *The Problem of Henry VIII Re-opened*. \$1.75

Tillyard, E. M. W. *Shakespeare's Problem Plays*. 156p. \$2.75

Tillyard, E. M. W. *Shakespeare's Last Plays* \$1.75

(Send for our complete catalogue)

HUMANITIES PRESS INC.

303 Fourth Avenue

New York 10, New York

Landmarks of Criticism

Edited by Edmund Creeth, Univ. of Michigan
"Anachronism in Shakespeare Criticism"

Elmer Edgar Stoll

(Modern Philology, VII (1910), 557-75)

In this early statement of his position, Stoll opposes a criticism which has always arrayed Shakespeare's plays "in the garb and fashion of the hour" and critics who examine merely their own impressions of them. Criticism itself—not only language, text, the external history of the plays and life of the playwright—is matter for scholars. Hitherto it has been too often an occupation for "poets, essayists, gentlemen of taste and leisure, not to mention . . . propagandists and blatherskites." Scholarship in Shakespeare's age can uncover the plays for what they really are. Even a critic as acute as Bradley (*Shakespearean Tragedy*, 1904) bewilderingly tangles truth with error when he abandons the historical spirit.

Idolatry is self-examination and anachronism. Everybody has a Shakespeare "in his own image," so that Furness, despite the text, will not allow that Lady Macbeth takes to drink and Sidney Lee finds Shakespeare's censure of cant anticipatory of Carlyle and Ruskin. (The censure of cant, "the cant of fair face and foul heart,"—what should it be else?—is three centuries behind the times.") To puzzle over the play as if it were life instead of story (Is the Danish court obtuse or servile in ignoring Claudius' incriminating behavior at the play?) is likewise idolatrous in respect to a dramatist "careless of realism, of probability."

Modern ideas of heredity (that Hamlet exhibits traits of both his father and mother) and of the newer psychology are simply read into the text. "Thus your Shakespeare is kept up to date." Especial havoc results to Shakespeare's technique when soliloquies are read in terms of theories of subconscious or unconscious self-deception. Iago is a liar, but not to the audience or to himself, and Hamlet's announced motive for sparing Claudius at prayer is literal. Shakespeare's racial psychology is conventional and popular and Schlegel's view of Othello as a complex problem in Kulturgeschichte "hopelessly un-Shakespearean."

In Shakespeare, Stoll believes, the practical demands of story are pre-eminent, to the exclusion of any underlying idea, of embodiment of any cause or principle, and when necessary of consistency of character. His Roman plays and English histories treat of persons, parties, factions and of their passions, not of political and moral ideas, except to enhance an occasion. Though Dowden and others find in LLL "a protest against idealizing away the facts of life," Shakespeare is noncommittal; King and lords do penance for breaking their vows of seclusion. Similarly in the dark comedies. The plot of M for M requires a Venice given over to carnal pleasure and an Isabella at one point "enslaved and sainted" who will later publicly proclaim her loss of virtue. No "Calvinistic contempt for an evil world" (Wendell) or other philosophy pervades the play. Like Ford, Shakespeare works primarily for theatrical effect.

His art is wholly explicit, in Shaw's phrase eternally unsuggestive. Speeches (Desdemona's remark to Iago that she be-guiles the time to seem more merry than she is) and whole scenes, as at the close of R and J, are devoted to explanation. Such a poet would hardly leave his audience to reckon on its own with subtleties like subconscious self-deception.

The meaning is of the surface and needless to say without symbolism. In contemporary drama, Ibsen's for example, any incident may have symbolic meaning in relation to a pervasive theme. "In the art of the

THE SHAKESPEARE QUARTERLY

"The Fall of Othello," John Arthos, S. Q. IX:2 (1958), 93-104.

Professor Arthos of the University of Michigan finds the "essential action" of Othello as in Don Quixote, often proposes falls "through some coincidence of a failure in himself and the wonderful persistence of Iago's improvisations." In discussing this "failure" Professor Arthos defines the idea of "the integrity of the self" as the touchstone for Othello's conception of honor. ". . . for Shakespeare the idea of the integrity of the self involves the notion of the adequacy of the self as the judge of truth, even absolute truth. The plays again make clear the fatality of delusion . . . and the cult of honor, in Othello as in Don Quixote, often proposes for adoration delusion instead of truth." Thus, Othello is motivated not so much by jealousy as by the notion of not being true to himself and thus violating his sense of honor. The struggle in Othello's mind was between loyalties each of which claimed absolute power, the love of "souls," and honor . . . the tragic action of Othello was the murder in Othello's mind, the substitution of the cause for the person, the displacement of love by the idea of the superior sanctity of honor."

"Francis Hayman's Illustrations of Shakespeare," W. M. Merchant, S. Q., IX:2 (1958), pp. 141-148.

The Reverend Mr. W. M. Merchant, in a richly illustrated article, studies Hayman's original drawings for Hanmer's *Shakespeare* (1744), comparing them with Gravelot's engraved frontispieces. "We have therefore a unique opportunity . . . of seeing with exactitude the faithfulness of an engraver to his original and the subtle but cumulatively significant stylistic changes produced in the parallel work of these two men."

Elizabethan drama, on the other hand, there is something solid, something impervious to thought. The figures are plastic, modeled in the round—like the actors themselves, who were stationed almost in the center of the house and seen from every side . . . The omens and forbodings are literal, objective, binding; like the ghosts, they are there for the story's sake and are never etherealized into a symbol and lifted into the realm of ideas."

Interpretation that does not recognize this concreteness is really assimilation. It envelops the outlines of the plays in an atmosphere of suggestion and, finding in Shakespeare its own values, softens the more glaring colors so that Falstaff ceases to be a coward, Shylock the butt, and Othello really jealous. In particular, the consolations found by Bradley and Dowden in the great tragedies would baffle and defeat Shakespeare's tragic purpose. Lear does not intimate the larger order which the transcendentalist Bradley sees and in which the destruction of Cordelia is annulled. Yet we cannot infer pessimism since the endings, conventional and often perfunctory like those of the comedies, are parables no more than the plays are. Nor, for that matter, does the order of the canon reflect Shakespeare's inner life—joyous, somber, and serene; he wrote to popular taste.

Stoll, finally, rejects any notion that Shakespeare can be enriched and illuminated by the cumulative appreciation of the ages. What beauties our forefathers thought they found are irrelevant if not there. "His works are his words . . . Hamlet, the Ghosts, Shylock, all the varied riches of his utterance must be to us, not what they have been or are, but that modified and corrected by whatever we can discover that they were to him."

Edmund Creeth our new "Landmarks" editor received his Ph.D. from the University of California at Berkeley.

"The Significance of Garrick's Letters to Hayman," Kalman A. Burnim, S. Q., IX:2 (1958), pp. 149-152.

Dr. Burnim of Valparaiso University continues the discussion of Hayman's work, focusing on his relationship with Garrick. The article quotes extensively from two letters by Garrick to Hayman, in which Garrick offers "a valid description" of his staging of the heath scene in *King Lear*, as well as of the final scene from *Othello*. "These two letters to Hayman testify that at least two eighteenth century illustrations of Shakespeare can be esteemed valid theatrical documents."

"The Elizabethan Rejection of Judicial Astrology and Shakespeare's Practice," Warren D. Smith, S. Q., IX:2 (1958), 159-76.

Professor Smith of the University of Rhode Island first clarifies the distinction between the occult judicial branch and the scientific natural branch of astrology in Shakespeare's England. The ancient superstition, judicial astrology, had been opposed by the Church from the beginning, and it is clear that the State "considered its practice a felony." Professor Smith next adduces evidence to show that Shakespeare "was alert to, if he did not in theory agree with, the conviction of church and government regarding prophecies" of judicial astrology.

Moreover, since "the documentary evidence available leaves the impression that . . . judicial astrology must have been under continual intellectual fire," it seems a fair assumption that Shakespeare "was conversant with some of the more important publications condemning" it. His uses of popular superstition are for "dramatic effectiveness" and cannot be regarded as evidence for his belief in judicial astrology. "The term itself is absent and the four instances of the Shakespearean synonym, *astronomy*, can hardly be taken as evidence of espousal." On the contrary, Shakespeare's work "evinces either indifference or hostility towards judicial astrology."

"Hamlet, the Pseudo-Procrastinator," Robert R. Reed, Jr., S. Q. IX:2 (1958), 177-86.

Professor Reed of Pennsylvania State University attempting to clear up difficulties in the "external obstacles" explanation for Hamlet's delay, examines the hero's speeches of self-reproach, the passages which "are undoubtedly the factor chiefly responsible for the school which insists that Hamlet's failure in the revenge motive is the result of an innate weakness." Actually, Reed shows, Elizabethan psychology supports the hypothesis "that Hamlet's unwarranted self-reproaches are the outgrowth of a conscience that is preoccupied with some past sin or omission."

But for an explanation of the psychic origin of Hamlet's "guilt complex" we must turn to modern psychology, specifically the theory of the structure and function of the superego, or the conscience. Here we see once Hamlet's superego has unqualifiedly accepted the Ghost's commandment, his self is divided by two injunctions, "one resulting from the precautions of reason, the other from the unconscious and insistent dictates of the superego."

Thus, "the longer Hamlet must delay in carrying out his pledge—first, for absolute proof of Claudius' guilt, later for the 'fitting hour'—the more forcible are the demands of the superego . . . , 'resulting in a guilt complex,' with a consequent 'need for punishment'—his self-reproaches. Hamlet's 'neurosis—a potent but temporary guilt complex—is the effect of the inaction which is prolonged by the external problems and for which he is brought to task by the predetermined and altogether illogical dictates of his conscience."

The Return to Laughter

Dolora G. Cunningham, San Francisco State College

The lamentable change is from the best; / The worst returns to laughter . . . KL, IV. 1.5

Whatever the substance of a particular play, Shakespeare obviously considered it to be a comedy if the action moved through trouble to joy: "all's well that ends well" is the basic formal distinction between comedy and tragedy as the Renaissance generally con- ceived of the two forms. If the traditional material as he did, it seems worthwhile to try to ascertain what distinction, other than the external feature of the happy ending, he made between comedy and tragedy. To per- ceive such a distinction is not to learn some- thing apart from the fact that a play ends happily, but rather is to learn how the bad beginning can logically, or fittingly within the terms of the action, end happily; for com- edy, as opposed to tragi-comedy, demands a fitting return to laughter, where we can see some principle of order working its way through the events to crown the end with happiness. If Shakespearean comedy makes well that which was not well, how does it do so?

Idea of The Good Life

At a broad level of generalization, through- out his comedies (romantic, problem, and last plays), Shakespeare organizes the comic return to laughter through reference to an idea of the good life which depends upon the disciplines of repentance and forgiveness for the alteration of undesirable feelings and attitudes, and for the repair of damaged hu- man relationships. Although a definitely criti- cal attitude helps to shape most of the so- called romantic comedies (through *Twelfth Night*), the dramatic action is usually con- cerned with the recognition and correction of the errors and absurdities of romantic love, so that important values in the experience may be realized through the freer and more rational love symbolized by marriage. In *Love's Labour's Lost*, the alteration necessary to the working out of the comic pattern in a happily ordered love is wrought by an almost painstaking progression through the steps of Christian penance, and the conditions of the happy ending are explicitly outlined in these terms within the play: the marriages are de- ferred until the foolish lovers shall have per- formed their works of penance. This early experiment with the conventional comic for- mula suggests an important aspect of its sig- nificance for Shakespeare: distressing situa- tions arising from failures of love can be happily resolved through the transforming power of divine grace, which is always op- erative in the process of repentance and for- giveness to endow disordered human beings with the capacity for changing the desires of their hearts and consequently the directions of their lives.

The Restoration of Order

In *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, the se- rious moral problem of the beloved as ultimate good is resolved by Proteus' repentance and Valentine's forgiveness; their friendship is re- paired, the restoration of order is begun, and we are ready for the "one mutual happiness" which can be expected to follow upon such a reversal of the developing pattern of be- trayal and violence. In the complex vision of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, considerable scope is allowed to the claims of private fancy, whose absurdities are almost painlessly adjusted to the demands of society, so that an almost ideal method of achieving order is mirrored in this working out of the comic process. The sorting out of all the tangled affairs depends upon the capacity to recog- nize error and to forgive, which is in turn a free gift to the wrangling human lovers, in the form of Oberon's magic potion, taking all error from their sight so that "all things shall be peace." The marvelous transfiguration of minds necessary to the happy ending is ef- fected by the supernatural intervention of the good fairies whose final blessing implies that supernatural powers will protect the truth of love and its children who are regarded as the unblemished possibilities of their parents.

In the comic resolution of *Twelfth Night*, the commonplace functions of Time as des- troyer and revealer are happily merged: by destroying the masks of falsehood, it fulfills its office of unveiling Truth; and moreover by providing an opportunity ("When . . . golden time convents") for gracious recovery from error, it functions as a principle of al- teration within the plot for those who have remained human in their folly and so recep- tive to the truth revealed in time. Malvolio's self-chosen exclusion from the general har- mony at the end underlines the terms on which it has been achieved - recognition of error and acceptance of things as they are—, and Fabian's free confession and plea for laughter rather than revenge, so that no quar- rel may "Taint the condition of this present hour," defines the attitude necessary to par- ticipation in the happy ending of Shakespear- ean comedy. The undecieved lovers, by con- trast with Malvolio, survive the most danger- ous folly of human love as portrayed in *Twelfth Night*, and in the other comedies dis- cussed: the perverse conviction that what one wants is the good simply because one wants it. In these comedies personal desire is dis- ciplined by, but not sacrificed to, the social norm; the dramatic action is focused upon the alteration of recalcitrant feelings and misguided loyalties so that the characters are able to accept what they can reasonably have: in this comic world, what wayward lovers get in the end turns out to be what is best for them and for others, and, miraculously, what they really want after all. One alternative to this condition of the happy ending is Malvo- lio's decision to remain imprisoned in a dis- eased self-love, and the extreme alternative is the tragic decision to die rather than settle for what is humanly possible in the circum- stances, as, for example, in the tragedy of *Macbeth*.

Exploring The Good Life

Where the emphasis in the comedies through *Twelfth Night* is on the ordering of private relationships within society, in *Measure for Measure* Shakespeare experiments with comic technique to explore the basis of the good life in a whole state. Although the art of living well is here subjected to a severe testing, many of its elements are found throughout the earlier comedies where less seriously deteriorated relationships are also put right through repentance and forgiveness as governing principles of comic order. In the last plays Shakespeare further extends the experimental technique of *Measure for Measure*, deliberately subduing profoundly dis- turbing situations to comic form. This final development calls for extensive comment, but it can be said that in *The Tempest* and *The Winter's Tale* divine grace is made to func- tion as the explicit means of resolving com- plex issues which would otherwise end in the lamentable violence of tragedy. In *The Tem- pest*, for example, the redemption of past sor- rows, for which Lear prays in vain over Cor- delia, depends upon the mysterious effective- ness of grace in Prospero's happy efforts to turn back the destructive movement of the action. This principle can be seen as helping to shape the final outcomes of Shakespeare's comedies, from the beginning of his career; it is most fully developed as a principle of dra- matic order in *Measure for Measure* and in the last plays, where the otherwise implac- able ways of evil are overcome by the in- fluence of grace in turning the hearts of the characters toward a proper human end, which is also the happy ending of Shakespearean comedy.

DIGESTS OF COMPLETED DISSERTATIONS

Jack R. Brown, Marshall College

Shakespeare's Treatment of the Virtue of Patience, Ruth Mickelson Levitsky, Uni- versity of Missouri, 1957, 237 pp.

This dissertation examines "how Shake- speare at different stages of his develop- ment . . . portrays heroic behavior under adversity."

Three theories of proper behavior current in the Renaissance are seen to influence Shakespeare at different times: (1) Stoic in- difference to death, and a single-minded pur- suit of virtue; (2) Christian charity and acceptance of God's will; (3) retaliatory action, based on a code of honor.

In the plays before *Julius Caesar*, Shake- speare's emphasis is on the stern justice demanded by the code of honor. Henry VI finds only disaster resulting from Christian patience, and Henry V chooses anger and honor.

With Brutus, Troilus, and Hamlet, Stoic indifference seems to be the solution to the problem of behavior under adversity. Troilus believes patience is only the "temporary con- trol of anger," and Brutus reveals Shake- speare's interest in the "possibility of heroic action unaided by emotion."

In the later plays, Christian patience is portrayed as more laudable than either a Stoic lack of passion or a retaliatory action demanded by a code of honor. "Uncompro- mising justice is denounced." Desdemona, Cordelia, and Edgar are examples of Chris- tian forgiveness, praiseworthy in each instance. Even Lear finds, as Troilus had not, that true patience is something more than con- trolled anger. As instances of the failure of non-Christian attitudes, Timon finds Stoic indifference inadequate, and Coriolanus is brought to see mercy and compassion as something higher than "honor and immov- ability."

Finally, in the romances, "Christian long- suffering and forgiveness continue to con- stitute the most acceptable manner of meet- ing adversity . . . Repentance is the end of punishment."

(The adjacent article is a digest of Dr. Cunningham's three lectures at the Oregon Shakespeare Festival under the title "The Dynamics of Shakespearean Comedy." Her book on the significance of comic form in Shakespeare is in progress.)

A matchless reference work

Available Again

Shakespeare Bibliography

An encyclopedia of every known issue of the writings of William Shakespeare and of recorded opinion thereon in the English language.

By William Jaggard

Over 36,000 entries and references plus thousands of illustrative notes and ex- tracts cover all details of every edition, as well as actors, biographers, trans- lators, etc. associated with Shakespeare or his productions in any way.

xxiv - 729 pp., 31 illus., \$12.50

Send for complete list of Shakespeare titles

Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.
131 East 23rd Street
New York 10, N.Y.

THE ITINERANT SCHOLAR

At the Southeastern Renaissance Conference,
University of South Carolina, April 17-18, 1959

The Macbeths and The Actors
Carol Jones Carlisle, University of
South Carolina

The most significant changes in the critical views of Macbeth and Lady Macbeth have probably come through the influence of the actors. This paper deals with the actors' changing interpretations of the two roles as evidenced by their own critical writings and, incidentally, comments on their influences on non-theatrical criticism.

Differences of opinion among actors who have analyzed Macbeth's character are usually concerned with one of two broad questions: 1) Is Macbeth "strong" or "weak"? 2) Is he an essentially noble person gradually corrupted, or is he thoroughly evil from the beginning? Criticisms of Lady Macbeth have also involved two questions: 1) Is she a "fiend" or a recognizable human being? 2) Is she a dominating "masculine" character or a fragile, seductive beauty, full of tenderness for her husband? A study of actors' criticisms reveals a trend toward the lightening of Lady Macbeth's character and a darkening of her husband's. It is only a trend, however, not a complete change; for the traditional interpretations still exist side by side with newer ones, the choice depending on the personal equipment and mental convictions of the individual actor.

It can be shown that the most radical changes in non-theatrical criticism have been significantly influenced by stage interpretations, if not entirely brought about by them.

Romeo and Juliet at the Swan Theatre, 1595
George Walton Williams, Duke University

As the Swan Theatre was in 1595 the most magnificent of the four London theatres, it probably satisfied every theatrical requirement of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, written the same year the theatre was built. This paper attempts to stage the play at the Swan, basing the staging on the DeWitt sketch.

The open stage with its two entries serves as the platform for most of the scenes of the play. The upper level is used in conjunction with the open stage for the two balcony scenes, II.ii and III.v. A temporary curtained pavilion between the two rear doors is posited as a discovery space to represent Juliet's bed in IV.iii and v and her tomb in V.iii. The main thesis of the paper is that when Juliet drinks the potion in IV.iii and falls on her bed, she remains concealed by the curtains behind the action of IV.iv, is discovered as dead by the Nurse in IV.v, remains concealed again behind the action of V.i and ii, and is discovered a second time by Romeo in V.iii.

By a common symbolic transfer involving simultaneous settings, Juliet's marriage bed in fact becomes her tomb.

Unusual Shakespeare Films

Jiri Trnka of Czechoslovak Film, Czechoslovakia, has written, directed, and designed a version of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* acted by puppets, in dance-mime, with a setting in a miniature enchanted forest. The film is produced in Eastmancolor and Cinemascope.

A Japanese version of *Macbeth* translated into terms of Japanese feudal history is also available.

The former film was shown this summer as part of the Stratford International Film Festival running along with the Shakespeare Festival in Stratford, Canada. The Japanese film was seen in 1958.

The Very Cause Of Hamlet's Lunacy
Denver Ewing Baughan, University of
Florida

Unfortunately Shakespeare gives almost no clue to what kind of person Hamlet was in the days that antedate the inception of the play. Certainly the King and Queen are not very reliable witnesses, and Horatio, who seems to have known Hamlet only at the university, is silent. Matters are not helped by the fact that even at the outset Hamlet is sicklied o'er with the dark cast of melancholy. Even though his first assuming of the antic disposition (in the so-called nunnery scene with Ophelia) appears madder than it has previously appeared, it is not any madder than the later actions in the closet scene with his mother and the grave scene with Laertes, both of which take place after the play-within-the-play, the point beyond which the antic disposition no longer makes sense.

That Shakespeare sets the stage for madness is obvious from the numerous references to the circular motion of the spheres and the fact that Hamlet's every action or plan comes full circle back where it started. In order to cover up the defect of a hero so attractive and yet so ineffectual, Shakespeare fills him again and again chock-full of violent determination to fly to a revenge that in the end only Claudius himself is able to accomplish. Thus the directness and clearheadedness of Claudius is made to compensate for the indirectness and muddleheadedness of Hamlet. In a word the mockery of madness so colors all that Hamlet does and thinks that it becomes the thing that it mocks. And the tragic irony of tragic ironies is that Hamlet himself is "Hoist with his own petar" as a result of his over-all strategy.

The Tragic Hero of Aristotle and Shakespeare
Raymond Jenkins, Catawba College

Aristotle's tragic hero is above the average in virtue but not pre-eminently good or just, and the flaw which causes his downfall is some frailty or error in judgment. But Shakespeare so ennobles his tragic hero that he appears far above the average in virtue and extraordinarily good and just. Likewise, his flaw is an intrinsic part of his total greatness, inseparable from his virtue. Shakespeare's hero far more closely resembles the high-minded man of Aristotle's *Ethics* than the ideal tragic hero of the *Poetics*. Like him, Shakespeare's hero is frank and outspoken, open in his hatreds and friendships, aspires to be superior, cares more for truth than reputation, and cares most for honor. Unlike Aristotle's ideal, Shakespeare's hero lacks the cardinal virtue of temperance, but he possesses Christian virtues which, to a Christian audience, make him appear the nobler man. The quality which distinguishes Aristotle's ideal man - magnanimity or greatness of soul - is the quintessential trait of Shakespeare's tragic hero. This nobility stirs our sympathy and admiration, reconciles us to his death, and makes us feel that he wins a spiritual victory despite his earthly defeat. He illustrates the paradox of Robert Browning - the successful failure.

Shakespeare and Music

According to an item in *The New York Times* thirty-one year old Dr. John P. Cutts of the University of Alberta, Canada, "is out to put some jump into William Shakespeare's plays." Performing Shakespeare with modern music is as "silly" as "actors wearing wrist watches." Dr. Cutts has collected forty boxes of film strips of early music in the libraries of England, Ireland, France, and the U.S. Articles have been written (Cf. SNL) and his *Music for Shakespeare's Company* is being printed. He has sung some of the songs on radio, but has not yet given any Elizabethan concerts.

"Observations on the Theory of 'Correlated' Plot-structure and Act-division"

Henry L. Snuggs, Wake Forest College

The theory that Renaissance critics evolved an "Andria formula" which correlated or integrated Donatus's protasis-epitasis-catastrophe plot-structure and his five-act division of Terence's comedies seems doubtful. Prominent critics like Minturno and Scaliger do not state such an integration, which is really to be found in one relatively little known Terentian commentator. The alleged "Andria formula", moreover, doesn't really describe the structure of the *Andria* itself, which modern scholars find to have only two empty stages; the comedy thus may be said to have three acts, but not five, as Donatus thought. There is no demonstrable coinciding of protasis, epitasis, catastrophe with either five acts or three acts. The theory of integration seems to be a mistaking of the critics' use of Donatus's traditional five-act division for convenient reference in describing where in a play the protasis, epitasis, and catastrophe occur. To say, as T. W. Baldwin does, that an "Andria formula" was so well known to Elizabethan playwrights, including Shakespeare, that it was a sort of recipe for writing plays seems to be an extravagant claim.

Authorizing Critical Trespass with Compare:
Image Collecting
in Shakespeare Interpretation.

Clifford P. Lyons
University of North Carolina

Concern with imagery in Shakespeare's plays, as in studies by Spurgeon, Knight, Clemen and others, while a critical interest of some significance, has been insufficiently restrained in methods and conclusions. A common procedure is to collect by categories—sea imagery, animal imagery, economic imagery—the auxiliary metaphoric imagery throughout a play and to infer from these massed figurative similitudes essential meanings of a play. The method neglects the selective significance of imagery in context and neglects unduly the fact that the imagery of a play is predominantly literal rather than figurative imagery.

At the Renaissance Conference, Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri, April 24, 1959

KING LEAR AT THE GLOBE

Hardin Craig, University of Missouri

Only a small part of this paper was presented at the conference, that especially showing medieval influence in the staging. Signs of this influence are neither numerous nor striking, but the play approached from that point of view, makes a significant contrast to J. C. Adams' "The Original Staging of *King Lear*" in *Adams Memorial Studies*, (1948). Act III, all in or near Gloucester's castle, has especially troubled modern stage-managers. Three heath scenes, each in a different place presumably, and two scenes in the castle alternating with them have sometimes caused modern stage managers to combine into one the like scenes, confusing the story, destroying its skillfully designed contrasts, and according to Granville-Barker making it impossible to play *Lear* effectively. The convention that exit at one door and immediate or almost immediate entry at another marks a change of scene avoids these difficulties, the short room scenes covering the passage of the actors in the tiring-house from one door to the other. The exposure of the middle door as the gate to the castle, barred against the King, becomes also a sort of symbol in later scenes of the daughters' hostility. Edgar's speech in which he announces his disguise is an obviously unlocated one, and his failure to notice Kent in the stocks, though visible to us the audience, is because he theatrically is not there, just as any simultaneous property is not supposed to be in any scene unless it is called attention to.

Digests of Periodical Reviews

Edited by

Mrs. Hanford Henderson, Gallaudet College

Clemen, Wolfgang, *Kommentar ZU Shakespeare's Richard III*. Gottingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957, DM25.

"... gives evidence of learning, balance and good sense.... Perhaps the author's recent study of earlier Elizabethan tragedy has not been an unmixed blessing for the reader. Again and again, Shakespeare's advance over his predecessors... is stressed... the reader comes to feel that he could take Shakespeare's superiority... more for granted... one's sense of the usefulness of this commentary will grow as one consults it on individual scenes and themes - which a full index will make it easy to do. A first reading does not... make one see the play in a radically new light, but it quickens alertness of response to many details."

J. C. Maxwell, MLR (April '59) 254-5.

"It is not easy to appraise Professor Clemen's obviously considerable personal contributions to the scholarship on *Richard III* in this book. Many of his points have of course been made earlier, as he makes quite clear in his references to his sources.... There can be no doubt, however, as to the insight and aptness with which earlier suggestions have been utilized and fitted into a larger context. It is precisely this lucidity of total vision organizing the most heterogeneous material, assessing it and bringing out its significance, that makes his study valuable."

Ants Oras, *Shakespeare Quarterly* (Winter '59) 89-91.

Walker, Alice and J. Dover Wilson (eds.). *Troilus and Cressida*. Cambridge University Press, 1957, \$3.50.

"Miss Walker's [textual] position is essentially a return to that of Chambers, who thought that all the variants could be accounted for by 'printing-house errors, Folio sophistication, and the difficulty experienced... in deciphering the foul papers'.... The literary introduction is to this reviewer more disappointing than the explanatory notes or the handling of the text.... Miss Walker simplifies the play... to smart satire.... If we are meant to deride Hector... ridicule Troilus... and close our hearts to the intolerable pain of his disillusion... Shakespeare has gone to some trouble to hide the cues."

Madeleine Doran, MLR (April, '59) 255-7.

"[Miss Walker] argues that the play is a 'comical satire'.... In purpose, the play is not primarily a love-story, but a pacifistic caveat revealing the follies of war; in style it is a precursor of the mock-heroic.... The text offered by Dr. Walker is eclectic.... She professes to have used the 1609 Quarto and the Folio indiscriminately, but seems to have relied upon the Quarto as a basic text.... When making the delicate decisions required for an eclectic text, Dr. Walker is self-willed, but not peevish nor contentious."

S. K. Heninger, Jr., MLN (April '59) 345-7.

McCormell, William G. *Tragedy*. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1957, \$5.00.

"Mr. McCormell's critical position is essentially... defensive and reactionary... he begins with an idea and then defends it against its two principal enemies. The idea is that the best way to understand a tragedy... is to see it as primarily a sequence of free moral choices on the part of the hero.... I think... that the idea... is defensible within the framework of the modern epistemological view of reality; had he begun his building on the foundation of a concept of reality broad enough to support art as well as morality... had he erected on that foundation the substructure of a concept of art; and had he then... erected his concept of tragedy, he might have built the Master Builder's single tall tower instead of two short ones."

Sears Jayne, *Shakespeare Quarterly* (Winter '59) 96-8.

CURRENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies, Edited by James G. McManaway, Giles E. Dawson, Edwin E. Willoughby, Washington, The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1948, pp. 808, \$10.00 (Available from Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York)

Although this section is called "Current Bibliography" we take the liberty of calling this splendid volume to the attention of Shakespeareans who may have thought that this book was long out of print. We ourselves were surprised to find that copies were still available. The Memorial volume was issued to honor Joseph Quincy Adams, Director of the Folger Shakespeare Library until his death on Nov. 10, 1946. The collection of studies finally published may well be called an encyclopedia of Shakespearean, dramatic, and literary criticism in that it shows the wide range of subjects and approaches possible. More than fifty of the most reputable scholars of the day contributed articles on imagery, history plays, "new" criticism, sources, staging, dramatic history, bibliography, sonnets, as well as on individual plays and characters. Twenty-six of the articles are on Shakespeare, the others are on similar subjects but on other Elizabethan authors. Among those found there are George C. Taylor, Hardin Craig, Alfred Harbage, O. J. Campbell, H. T. Price, George W. Stone, Donald W. McGinn, T. W. Baldwin, Matthew W. Black, Matthias A. Shaaber, George F. Reynolds, G. B. Harrison, Robert A. Law, John C. Adams, E. E. Stoll, Charlton Hinman, Elkin C. Wilson, R. C. Bald, A. H. Carter, Willard Farnham, W. W. Greg, and many others. Considering the number and the authority of these studies, the volume would make a handsome addition to any home or university library.

Shakespeare's Town and Country, described by Levi Fox, Cotman House, n.d. unpagged, 125 bd. Available through Jarrold & Sons Ltd, St. James, Norwich.

This large (8¾ x 11½") and attractive volume contains more than forty beautifully colored photographs of Stratford and its environs. While views of the Birthplace Trust properties account for more than a third of the book, Mr. Fox attempts and succeeds in catching the area which "quite apart from any literary associations, possesses a natural and historical and architectural heritage of an unmistakably English character." The history of Stratford-upon-Avon Mr. Fox has written before. The present work does with the aid of color photography what other books have done before by words. One of the striking photographs shows Shakespeare's grave and monument strewn with numerous floral tributes at the close of the annual birthday celebration.

Foakes, R. A. (ed.). *King Henry VIII. (The Arden Shakespeare.)* London, Methuen, 1957, 21s.

"The first part of the 'technical introduction' is occupied mainly with that long-drawn-out campaign in which the first conspicuous engagement was Spedding's article.... Mr. Foakes... sees reason to distrust much of the evidence brought forward by the disintegrators.... His... case for the play's integrity rests provisionally on the consistency in the treatment of historical material... on the prevalence of a particular vein of imagery, and a tone of feeling which he characterizes... in his 'critical introduction'.... He aligns *Henry VIII* with *Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *The Tempest* - at their expense.... To me, doubtful of the wisdom of this approach, it appears not only that their merits suffer in the comparison, but also that some quality of strength... in this play is overlooked."

Mary Lascelles, RES (May '59) 195-8.

SHAKESPEARE QUARTERLY

"Shakespeare's Early Tragic Mode," R. F. Hill, SQ, IX:4, 1958, 455-469.

Unnaturalistic, rhetorical imagery of the Senecan variety may be found everywhere in Shakespeare's early tragedies and histories, and, though Coleridge claimed that this style is the natural expression of the human mind in deep passion, Professor Hill cannot agree. He feels, however, that Richard II does express his anguish by rhetorical speeches and that in the early plays Shakespeare's characters always express emotion in this way. "The more intense the feelings, the more artificial the language." It must be admitted, however, that Shakespeare's early tragic style is not consistently rhetorical. In *Titus Andronicus* and *Richard III* the characters of Aaron and Richard constantly slip into naturalistic speech, and Professor Hill feels that Shakespeare is unconscious of this. He is struggling to find perfect form. In *Richard II* he banishes the naturalistic. In his later tragedies he "marries" the rhetorical and the naturalistic modes successfully, glancing from heaven to earth without incongruity.

"The First Hungarian Translation of Shakespeare," Thomas R. Mark, SQ, IX:4 1958, 471-478.

Francis Kazinczy, Hungary's literary dictator of the last part of the 18th century, translated *Hamlet* into Hungarian with the hope that it would be the first play in the native language to appear on the Hungarian stage. The public theaters then produced only German plays. Kazinczy could not read English; so he translated Schroder's German version of *Hamlet*. He was following Schroder in omitting the roles of Voltimand, Cornelius, Fortinbras, and Osric, and in making Rosencrantz and Guildenstern one. Except for the play within the play and Ophelia's mad songs, Kazinczy's version is "stiff, artificial prose," and, since this tended to be verbose, many of the poetic passages had to be cut. *Hamlet* never sets sail for England, nor does he fight with Laertes. After the Queen dies of the poison, *Hamlet* stabs his uncle, and he and Laertes remain alive and become fast friends.

The actors who first spoke Hungarian on the stage found *Hamlet* too difficult to lead off with when they opened in 1790, and the play was not acted until 1794. Kazinczy's translation did, however, become a permanent part of the repertory of all Hungarian theatrical companies, and it was not replaced by a translation more faithful to the original text until 1839.

"Reputation, oft Lost Without Deserving..." Marvin Rosenberg, SQ, IX:4, 1958, 499-506.

Though "bowdlerize" has a bad connotation in modern English, Professor Rosenberg feels that Thomas Bowdler does not deserve the ignominy into which he has fallen. He is to be defended for the following reasons: 1. Bell's Shakespeare of 1773-4 had removed more than a third of Shakespeare's lines to make them "decent." Bowdler's Family Edition gave Victorians their Shakespeare "nearly entire," and Bowdler should therefore be looked on as a restorer rather than as a destroyer. 2. Bowdler rose above the Victorian culture at times. He refused to remove all the indelicate material from *Othello*, realizing that to do so would destroy the play. Bowdler should be compared with the Reverend James Plumptre. In his unpublished version of *Othello* Plumptre was not satisfied with deleting all indecencies. He was infected by a "Rymer-like passion for poetic justice," and the happy ending he gave *Othello* is worse than Tate's happy ending for *King Lear*. Professor Rosenberg suggests that we replace the word "bowdlerization" by "plumptrization."

REVIEW OF PERIODICALS

A PERFECT FOLIO

The Barton Collection of the Boston Public Library contains an "especially rich" Shakespearean section whose "jewel" is a copy of the First Folio. Zoltan Haraszti in the *Boston Public Library Quarterly* (April 1958) calls attention to a little known essay, "Description of a Copy of the First Folio of the Plays of Shakespeare now in the Collection of T. P. Barton," which is reproduced in full. Written in the third person by Mr. Barton, and published in 1860, the essay details the acquisition of this copy from Thomas Rodd of London in 1845, reprints correspondence concerning the genuineness of this copy ("If you do not find it in every instance perfect and genuine, I will make you a present of the book, and will, in addition, forfeit ten pounds a leaf for every one that is not genuine"), and describes minutely the condition (the copy was examined "three several times" for rents, mended leaves, ink-marks, etc.), and concludes "no one . . . can for a moment hesitate . . . to pronounce this to be a thoroughly genuine, perfect, and uncommonly fine copy of that most rare and interesting volume, the FIRST FOLIO SHAKESPEARE." [Thomas P. Barton, "The Library's First Folio of Shakespeare," *Boston Public Library Quarterly*, X:2 (April 1958), 63-77.]

Henry VIII, V, ii, 25-31

Professor MacDonald Emslie of University College, London, finds in *Henry VIII*, V, ii, 25-31, an undercurrent which tends to justify the king's becoming the head of the church. The word above (there's one above 'em [the council] yet) may identify partially the king with God, but at the same time it literally indicates the presence of the king on the upper stage, where literally he is. This rare instance in the Folio of a stage direction indicating with certainty the use of the upper stage makes a politically dangerous overtone acceptable to a contemporary audience. In this ambiguous passage, as elsewhere in the play, an awkward historical-religious subject is handled with delicacy. ["Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*, V, ii, 25-31," *The Explicator*, XVII:4 (January 1959), Item 29.]

WORDS, WORDS, WORDS . . .

In attempting to explain what Frank Ker-mode in the recent Arden edition of *The Tempest* said has "not been satisfactorily explained," M. K. Flint and E. J. Dobson investigate the phrase "weake Masters" (V.i. 41) referring to the elves and "demy-puppets," and discovers that masters is historically equivalent to ministers, i.e., instruments or agents. (Hammer had already emended masters to ministers in 1744.) Historically, master seems to be derived from or analogous to mister from Old French mestier, ultimately from Latin misterium. "Mystery" of a trade in the Elizabethan sense is thereby analogous to "mastery." In *The Tempest*, when Gonzalo is appointed "Master of this design," it may mean that he is in charge of the project, but because of the old meaning, it may also mean "that Gonzalo has been appointed to carry out the design, to be its 'instrument.'" The elves are masters in the same sense. ["Weak Masters," *Review of English Studies*, X:37 (February 1959), pp.58-60.]

"A Medieval Western"

When Prime Minister Archibald Macmillan entertained President Eisenhower during the latter's recent visit to England he was shown Lawrence Olivier's *Richard the Third*. The Prime Minister called the play a kind of "medieval western."

Ned B. Allen, University of Delaware; Barbara Alden; Nancy Lee Riffe, U. of Ky.; Gordon W. O'Brien, Youngstown Univ.; John Shaw, Hiram; Joseph H. Summerell, N.Y. State University, Plattsburgh; Margaret Lee Wiley, Arlington State College.

CRUCIAL SONG IN THE MERCHANT OF VENICE?

John R. Brown of The Shakespeare Institute disagrees with Peter Seng of Connecticut College that the quibbling verses in LLL (IV.2.58-63) are analogous to the "Tell me where is Fancy bred" song in the M of V. The rhymes of "bred . . . head, nourished" are not a clue given by Portia to make Bassanio select the "lead" casket. She is not charmingly breaking "the conditions of her father's will and . . . vow of some fifty lines earlier." The song is sung while Bassanio comments to himself (as the stage direction indicates) in order to "avoid a recital of the inscriptions" which the audience has already heard twice. If the song were crucial, Bassanio would not have had to debate with himself for an additional 34 lines after the song is over. The purpose of the song is to prevent the third recital of facts, to dignify and heighten the "dramatic context," and to prepare "the audience for Bassanio's following speech in such a way that his sentiments are given a more immediate and wider application." ["The Riddle Song in 'The Merchant of Venice,'" *Notes and Queries*, VI:6 (June 1959), p.235.]

BIRTH OF A CHARACTER

S. Musgrove agrees with H. Jenkins that 1 and 2 *Henry IV* indicate that Shakespeare changed his mind during composition, especially in 2HIV, and that the characterization of Pistol is a further indication of it. Before Pistol appears at II.4.105, his character has been developed by others; he is a swaggerer, bully, drunkard, and rascal. His first appearance on stage illustrates this behavior. However, at the moment he utters "I'll see her damned first" in his reply to Doll's insults, a change takes place. Shakespeare may have paused at "damned," wondered how to continue, and then, with the association of this word in his mind, began the new conception: the dramatic rhodomontade for which he is characteristic — "damned first, — to Pluto's damned lake, by this hand, to the infernal deep, with Erebus and tortures vile . . ." From there on he speaks in blank verse except for minor exceptions. The comic result was so effective that Shakespeare continued him in the same vein in *Henry V*. The character was not fully planned at first, and "the idea of making him an habitue of the theatre . . . came to him when he had reached the end of his first design for Pistol the swaggerer." ["The Birth of Pistol," *Review of English Studies*, X:37 (Feb. 1959), pp. 56-8]

"LOVE IS NOT LOVE . . ."

The first scene of *King Lear* has been called improbable; Lear's question "How much do you love me?" has been called imponderable; and his equation 'so much love = so much land' is "said to be immoral." The scene probes the spiritual and material meanings of the word. Actually there are two loves. Love in the sense of appraising or estimating the value comes from Old English *lofian* whereas love in the usual sense is derived from Old English *lufian*. In the course of language and pronunciation development the two words had their meaning blended. An analogous case in French is the collision and blending of *esmer* (to reckon) and *aimer* (to love). Goneril's punning lines on love: "Sir, I love you more than words can wield the matter . . ." etc., are close to "the tabulated catalogue in the manner of an estimate," and probably derive from the Lear story in Holinshed which is similar to the French Roman de Brut by Wace in both of which the same play on the word love occur. Cordelia rejects "the whole immoral nature of love as an expressible 'value.'" Unlike her sisters, she does not play on love (so much land, so much love), but says "I love your majesty/According to my bond; no more no less." ["Love' in *King Lear*," *Review of English Studies*, X:38 (May 1959), pp. 178-81.]

SHAKESPEARE

21 Play Edition, Revised

Hardin Craig

The text of twenty-one plays, with an unusually complete and authentic presentation of the life and times of Shakespeare. Illustrations and end-sheet maps of England and London have been added in this revision.

1216 pages \$6.75 list

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

Chicago Atlanta Dallas Palo Alto
Fair Lawn, N. J.